

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 6-12 were pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 are being amended and new claims 13 and 14 are being added. No new matter is involved.

Applicants' prior Amendment of August 19, 2002 canceled claims 1-5 without prejudice, and added claims 6-12. Apparently, confusion arose over the setting forth of claims 1-5 together with the designation (unchanged) in Appendix A of the Amendment. Again, claims 1-5 have been canceled.

Further at the top of page 2 of the Office Action, it is stated that Figures. 1 and 2 of the drawings should be labeled as prior art. However, this is inappropriate inasmuch as Figures 1 and 2 show related art and not prior art. At the time the present application was prepared, the subject matter of Figures. 1 and 2 was known to Applicants and not to the public. It is not prior art. Therefore, Figures. 1 and 2 are correctly labeled as related art.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Informalities in the claims are pointed out therein.

In response, Applicants are amending the claims so as to make them clear and definite. In Claim 6, the power supply circuit is now defined as having an output coupled to the second capacitor. The objectionable recitations relating to the control circuit and the power supply clock are being deleted, and the control circuit is being defined as generating a boosted voltage. Regarding claim 7, a separate recitation is being added that the circuit includes means for selectively providing a power save control instruction to provide a basis for later references to such instruction in the claim. Claims 9 and 10 are being amended in similar fashion. Regarding the recitation "the input voltage", claims 9 and 10 do not have such

recitation. However, the sixth line of claim 8 contains such recitation, and this is being amended to recite "an input voltage". With respect to claim 12, the form of such claim is being improved so as to define the display device as including at least two charge pump type supply circuits.

Therefore, claims 6-12 as amended should now be clear and definite.

Beginning at the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action, claims 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Figures 1 and 2 of the present application. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Figures 1 and 2 of the present application are not prior art, but rather are related art. The subject matter Figures 1 and 2 was known to Applicant at the time the present application was prepared but not to the public. It is not prior art and cannot be used to reject the claims of the present application. That being the case, claims 6-12 are submitted to be patentable.

New claim 13 depends from and further defines claim 6 in terms of limitations similar to those presented in original claim 1, which is now canceled. More specifically, claim 13 recites "a supply voltage is generated by switch controlling said first switch and said second switch and boosting an input voltage to a voltage of  $n$  times or  $-n$  times the input voltage based on said power supply clock produced by an integrated circuit using said system clock, said integrated circuit being operated using said system clock". Therefore, new claim 13 distinguishes patentably over the art.

New claim 14 depends from and further defines claim 6 in terms of two boosted voltages being generated and two power supply clocks being generated to switch off the two boosted voltages at different times, whereby a power supply of a panel is switched off after a power supply for a driving circuit is switched off. Such limitations relate to the features described in the specification at line 1 of page 18 through lines 8 of page 19. As described therein, two boosted voltages are

generated and two power supply clocks are generated in order to switch the two boosted voltages off at different timings. When the power supply of the panel 200 and the power supply of the driving circuit 101 are switched off, the switching off of the power supply for the driving circuit 101 is performed first.

In conclusion, claims 6-12 and new claims 13 and 14 are submitted to be clear and definite and to clearly distinguish patentably over the art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6842 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: May 16, 2003

By:   
John P. Scherlacher  
Registration No. 23,009  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701